

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached replacement sheet of drawing includes changes to Figure 4.

### REMARKS

Applicant has rewritten claims 1 and 8 to include the limitations of claims 2 and 9 respectively, cancelled claims 2, 9, and 15-18 and amended claims 5 and 12 to eliminate the phrase beginning with "i.e.". Applicant is submitting herewith a replacement drawing for Figure 4. In the new Figure 4, Applicant has indicated that the "initial gray level" stands for the value " $X_1$ ". In Figure 3 and the "proportioned array set" stand for the value " $X_2$ ". Therefore, it is Applicant's contention that because every value of the adjusted gray level  $X_2$  in Figure 4 is obtained by the calculation method in Figure 3 to make the look-up table, Figures 3 and 4 include the features of steps 4 and 5 in claim 1. Accordingly, it is Applicant's contention that this application is now in proper form for allowance.

In rewriting claims 1 and 8 Applicant has corrected the articles as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 2-4 and 9-11 were considered to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. In the present case Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 2 and 9 into claims 1 and 8 and cancelled claims 2 and 9. Therefore, it is Applicant's contention that amended claim 1, dependent claims 3 and 4, amended claim 8, dependent claims 10 and 11 should be allowed.

Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 were also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. These claims were rejected because of the use of the phrase "i.e." That phrase has now been eliminated. Accordingly, it is Applicant's contention that amended claims 5 and 12 and dependent claims 6 and 13 are now in proper form and should be allowed.

In the aforementioned Office Action original claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC

103. It is respectfully submitted that since amended claims 1 and 8 are allowable that dependent claims 7 and 14 should also be allowed.

Since all of the claims are now in proper form and clearly and patentably distinguished over the cited art, prompt favorable action is requested.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP**

  
**DAVID E. DOUGHERTY**

Registration No. 19,576

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

(703) 684-1111

(703) 518-5499 Facsimile

**Date: June 25, 2007**

**DED/cem**